



राजपत्र, हिमाचल प्रदेश

हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्य शासन द्वारा प्रकाशित

सोमवार, 8 अप्रैल, 2019/18 चैत्र, 1941

हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार

INDUSTRIES DEPARTMENT
A-Section

NOTIFICATION

Shimla-2, the 8th March, 2019

No. Ind-A(B)8-4/2016.—On the recommendations of the Departmental Promotion Committee, the Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to order the promotion of following Managers, DIC to the post of General Manager, DIC/ Deputy Director of Industries (Class-I,

Gazetted) in the pay scale of ₹10300—34800+ ₹5400 Grade pay in the Department of Industries, H.P. with immediate effect :—

Sl. No.	Name of Official
1.	Smt. Promila Devi
2.	Smt. Chhime Angmo

The above Officers shall remain on probation for a period of two years. They shall also exercise option for fixation of pay under the provisions contained in FR-22, within a period of one month from the date of issue of this Notification.

The Governor, Himachal Pradesh is further pleased to order the posting/transfer of following General Managers, DIC, with immediate effect, in public interest:—

Sl. No.	Name of Officer/ Official	From	To
1.	Sh. Pawan Kumar	District Industries Centre, Kullu	District Industries Centre, Chamba against vacancy.
2.	Smt. Promila Devi	O/o District Industries Centre, Bilaspur	District Industries Centre, Bilaspur on her promotion.
3.	Smt. Chhime Angmo	O/o District Industries Centre, Mandi	District Industries Centre, Kullu on her promotion.

The above mentioned Officers are directed to report for duty at their new place of posting immediately and send joining report to this Department as well as to the Director of Industries, Himachal Pradesh, Udyog Bhawan, Shimla (through proper channel).

By order,

MANOJ KUMAR,
Addl. Chief Secretary (Inds.).

INDUSTRIES DEPARTMENT
A-Section

NOTIFICATION

Shimla-2, the 8th March, 2019

No. Ind-A(B)8-4/2016.—In partial modification to this department's notification of even no. & dated 8-3-2019, the Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to post Sh. Pawan Kumar, presently posted as General Manager, District Industries Centre, Kullu and under transfer to District Industries Centre, Chamba; to District Industries Centre, Lahaul & Spiti at Keylong against vacancy, with immediate effect, in public interest.

The above mentioned Officer is directed to report for duty at his new place of posting immediately and send joining report to this Department as well as to the Director of Industries, Himachal Pradesh, Udyog Bhawan, Shimla (through proper channel).

By order,

MANOJ KUMAR,
Addl. Chief Secretary (Inds.).

INDUSTRIES DEPARTMENT
A-Section

NOTIFICATION

Shimla-2, the 8th March, 2019

No. Ind-A(B)8-2/2018.—On the recommendations of the Departmental Promotion Committee, the Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to order the promotion of following Industrial Promotion Officer/Superintendent Grade-II, to the post of Manager (DIC) (Class-II, Gazetted) in the pay scale of ₹10300-34800+ ₹4400 Grade pay in the Department of Industries, H.P. with immediate effect:—

Sl. No.	Name of Official
1.	Sh. Rajeev Kumar, IPO
2.	Sh. Chouhan Singh, Supdt. Grade-II

The above Officers shall remain on probation for a period of two years. They shall also exercise option for fixation of pay under the provisions contained in FR-22, within a period of one month from the date of issue of this Notification.

The Governor, Himachal Pradesh is further pleased to order the posting/transfer of following Managers, DIC, with immediate effect, in public interest:—

Sl. No.	Name of Officer	From	To
1.	S/Sh. Sunny Grack, (on contract basis)	District Industries Centre, Mandi (presently deployed at Directorate of Industries).	Directorate of Industries [his salary may be drawn against the vacant post of Sr. Technical Officer (Chemical) till further orders].
2.	Rajeev Kumar	O/o SWCA, Baddi, Distt. Solan	District Industries Centre, Mandi against Sr. No. 1, on his promotion.
3.	Chouhan Singh	O/o District Industries Centre, Solan.	District Industries Centre, Nahan on his promotion.

The above mentioned Officers are directed to report for duty at their new place of posting immediately and send joining report to this Department as well as to the Director of Industries, Himachal Pradesh, Udyog Bhawan, Shimla (through proper channel).

By order,

MANOJ KUMAR,
Addl. Chief Secretary (Inds.).

INDUSTRIES DEPARTMENT

CORRIGENDUM

Shimla-2, the 5th April, 2019

No. Ind.-A(B)8-4/2016.—*Please read* Pay Scale of General Manager DIC/Deputy Director of Industries (Class-I Gazetted) as " ₹15600—39100+5400 Grade Pay" *instead of* " `10300—34800+ 5400 Grade Pay" in the notification of even number dated 08th March, 2019.

By order,
Sd/-

Addl. Chief Secretary (Inds.).

LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT DEPARTMENT

NOTIFICATION

Shimla, the 26th March, 2019

No. Shram(A)6-1/2019 (Awards) Shimla.—In exercise of the powers vested under section 17 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor Himachal Pradesh is pleased to order the publication of awards of the following cases announced by the Presiding Officer, Labour Court Shimla on the website of the Department of Labour & Employment Government of Himachal Pradesh.

Sl. No	Reference/ Application	Title	Section
1.	Ref. 90/2018	Sh. Misser Chand V/s Tarsem Bharti, Prop M/s R. P. Appliances, Shoghi District Shimla (H.P.).	10
2.	Ref. 161/2017	Chet Ram V/s The secretary, HPSEB Ltd., Vidyut Bhawan, Chaura Maidan Shimla, H.P & Anr.	10
3.	Ref. 31/2017	Himalayan International School Workers Union V/s Himalayan International School, Chharabra, Shimla (H.P.).	10

By order,

NISHA SINGH, IAS
Addl. Chief Secretary (Lab. & Emp.).

**IN THE COURT OF SH. CHIRAG BHANU SINGH, PRESIDING JUDGE, H.P.
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, SHIMLA**

Reference No : 90 of 2018

Instituted on : 1-6-2018

Decided on : 19-1-2019

Misser Chand s/o Late Shri Jagat Ram, c/o Shri D. D. Mehta, GPO Shimla, District Shimla, H.P. . *Petitioner.*

Tarsem Bharti, Prop. M/s R. P. Appliances Unit-II, Plot No. 85/1, Industrial Area Shoghi, District Shimla, H.P. . *Respondent.*

Reference under section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947

For petitioner : Shri Rahul Kashyap, Advocate.

For respondent : Ex-parte.

AWARD

The following reference has been received for adjudication from the appropriate government:

“Whether termination of the services of Shri Missar Chand s/o Late Shri Jagat Ram c/o Shri G. D. Mehta, GPO Shimla-171001 during the month of June 2016 by Shri Tarsem Bharti, Prop. R. P. Appliances, Unit-II, Plot No. 85/1, Industrial Area Shoghi, District Shimla, H.P. allegedly, without complying with the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is legal and justified? If not, what relief including reinstatement, amount of backwages, seniority, past service benefits and compensation the above ex-worker is entitled to from the above management?”

2. The case set-up by the petitioner in the statement of claim is that he was engaged as a Supervisor in April, 2014 in the Bharti Filling Station and thereupon after April, 2015 came to be appointed as an Accountant and Manager in R. P. Appliances, Industrial Area, Shoghi, Shimla. He continued to work as such till 7-6-2016, when he had received a legal notice dispensing with his services.

3. Per the petitioner, the notice of discharge so received alleged that the petitioner had left the firm without any information. The respondent had also noticed major anomalies in the stocks maintained by the petitioner. While replying to the said notice, the petitioner had submitted that he had maintained the stock and accounts of the firm till March, 2016 and thereafter one Rinku Ram had been maintaining the same.

4. It is further averred by the petitioner that though he was engaged on ₹ 40,000/- per month, but, he was always paid salary @ of ₹ 15,000/- per month. His services have been dispensed with in gross violation of the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act. He has completed 240 days in each calendar year.

5. It is further averred by the petitioner that the respondent had issued a cheque amounting to ₹ Ten Lakhs Eighty Nine Thousand only (₹ 10,89,000/-) against the pending salary upto June, 2017 but the aforesaid cheque was dishonored and the case is pending before the Learned JMFC-II Shimla. The petitioner thus prays that the respondent may be directed to re-engage him and pay his entire salary.

6. The respondent management in its wisdom thought it prudent not to appear, despite having being served. They were set *ex-parte vide* an order dated 3-10-2018 passed by my Ld. Predecessor. The tracking report issued by the postal department unequivocally shows that the registered letter had been duly delivered to the respondent. However he chose not to contest the proceedings.

7. The question which arises for determination may be cast thus:

1. Whether the termination of the petitioner is in violation of the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 as alleged and as such is illegal and unjustified? If so, to what relief the workman is entitled to? .*OPP.*

2. Relief

8. Having considered the pleadings, evidence and other attendant materials placed on record my findings on the issues framed above are thus:

Issue No. 1: Partly-yes

Relief: Partly allowed as per the operative part of the award

REASONS FOR FINDINGS

Issue No.1:

9. The petitioner while appearing as PW-1 has tendered his affidavit Ex. PW-1/A and reiterated the submissions made in the statement of claim.

10. Per the petitioner, he was initially engaged as a Supervisor in April, 2014 in Bharti Filling Station and after April, 2015, he came to be appointed as an Accountant/ Manager in the respondent firm, known in the name and style R. P. Appliances and his services had been dispensed with *vide* legal notice Mark P-1.

11. Per the petitioner, the discharge was punitive in nature as certain allegations regarding anomalies in the stocks were highlighted by the respondent which had been duly controverted by the petitioner in his reply, Mark P-2. While filing reply, the petitioner had made it clear to the respondent that after April, 2016 one Rinku Ram was maintaining the stocks and accounts of the firm.

12. The petitioner has also deposed that he had completed 240 days in each calendar year. Though, he has further testified that he demanded salary and EPF from respondent firm *vide* Annexure P-3 (which is though not placed on record). However, the respondent firm prepared false entry in the stock register merely to harass and terminate his services.

13. The deposition of the petitioner has gone un-rebutted as the respondent chose not to contest the proceedings. The un-rebutted testimony of the petitioner shows that he had

been working with the respondent firm. The said fact is further fortified by the legal notice issued by the respondent firm to the petitioner on 7-6-2016 (Mark P-1). The test and tenor of the legal notice undoubtedly is punitive, as it alleges certain misconduct to the petitioner and one Rinku Ram. It is further suggestive of the fact that the petitioner is alleged to have left the firm on his own and the respondent apparently intended to initiate criminal proceedings under section 420 IPC and other penal provisions and hence, the notice. As to what transpired thereupon cannot be made out from the record. However, the petitioner had responded by replying to the aforesaid notice *vide* Mark P-2. He has denied his involvement in the entire episode and rather fastened it on one Rinku Ram.

14. The conjoint reading of the deposition of the petitioner and Mark P-1 and Mark P-2, on record, does prove that the petitioner had been working with the respondent firm. No doubt, some penal action was intended to be initiated against the petitioner, but, there is nothing on record to remotely suggest that the services of the petitioner were terminated after some enquiry, either for some misconduct or for un-authorized absence from duty. The un-rebutted deposition of the petitioner also suggest that he had completed 240 days in each calendar year and the said factum has also gone un-rebutted. There is nothing on record to remotely suggest that the provisions of Section 25-F was adhered to by the respondent firm. The statutory provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act has been given a complete go bye by the respondent firm. He was indeed entitled to the protection envisaged under section 25-F and having failed to do so, the respondent firm has made itself amenable to re-engage the petitioner forth-with. The petitioner has nowhere submitted in his testimony that he was not ably employed during the said interregnum and as such he shall not be entitled to any back-wages for the aforesaid period.

15. For all the aforesaid reasons discussed hereinabove, it is held that the termination of the petitioner was in violation of the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, more particularly Section 25-F. The termination is held to be illegal, unlawful and unjustified. As a sequel thereto, the petitioner is directed to be re-instated forth-with, though, without any back-wages. Issue is decided accordingly.

Relief :

For all the reasons discussed hereinabove the reference is partly allowed. The termination of the petitioner is held to be illegal and unjustified being violative of the provisions of section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. As a sequel the respondent firm is directed to re-engage the petitioner forth-with though without back-wages. The petitioner shall however be entitled to seniority and continuity in service. The reference is answered accordingly. A copy of this award be sent to the appropriate Government for publication in the official gazette and the file after completion be consigned to records.

Announced in the open court today this 19th day of January, 2019.

Sd/-
(CHIRAG BHANU SINGH),

*Presiding Judge,
Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Shimla.*

**IN THE COURT OF SH. CHIRAG BHANU SINGH, PRESIDING JUDGE, H.P.
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, SHIMLA**

Ref. No. 161 of 2017

Instituted on 2-11-2017

Decided on 19-1-2019

Chet Ram s/o Shri Sita Ram r/o Village Panden, P.O. Khera, Tehsil Sunni, District Shimla, H.P. *.Petitioner.*

1. The Secretary HPSEB Ltd., Vidyut Bhawan, Chaura Maidan, Shimla, H.P.
2. The Senior Executive Engineer, electrical Division, HPSEBL, Sunni, District Shimla, H.P. *. Respondents.*

Reference under section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947

For petitioner : Shri Narinder Sharma, Advocate.

For respondents : Shri Ramakant Sharma, Advocate.

AWARD

The following reference was received for adjudication from the appropriate government:

“Whether demand of Shri Chet Ram s/o Shri Sita Ram, Village Paden, P.O. Khera, Tehsil Sunni, District Shimla H.P. *vide* demand notice dated nill (copy enclosed) before the Secretary, Himachal Pradesh State Electricity Board Ltd., Vidyut Bhawan, Chaura Maidan Shimla, H.P. for reinstatement of his services alongwith seniority and consequently regularization is legal and justified? If yes, what relief including reinstatement, amount of back-wages, seniority, past service benefits and compensation the above ex-worker is entitled to from the above employer?”

2. The case of the petitioner, as it emerges from the statement of claim is that he was initially engaged on daily wage basis with the respondent board in 1993 and he worked as such in Sunni Division, Tehsil Sunni, District Shimla, H.P. Apart from the petitioner, many other persons had been engaged by the respondent board on daily wages. The board thereupon terminated the services of the petitioner, despite having retained many juniors to him. The board is also stated to have appointed many fresh hands after his termination, which was in clear cut violation of the provisions of sections 25-F, G and H of the Industrial Disputes Act.

3. It is further the case of the petitioner that he had challenged his termination before the Learned H.P. State Administrative Tribunal. The OA being 1631/1998. In pursuance to and interim order passed by the said Tribunal, he continued working on daily wages till 2002. It however, transpired that the OA preferred by the petitioner was however returned for want of jurisdiction. However, in the mean time the respondent board had issued a

communication dated 6-11-2002, converting the services of the petitioner to work charge. The communication thereof has been annexed as Annexure A-1 (Ex. PW-1/A).

4. It seems despite the said communication having been issued, the petitioner was not conferred the status of a work charge and as such he was again constrained to file an OA before the Learned Administrative Tribunal, which came to be transferred to Hon'ble High Court as CWP (T) No. 8918/2008, on the scraping of the H.P. State Administrative Tribunal. The Hon'ble High Court, while deciding the aforesaid writ petition *vide* order dated 1-12-2010, allowed the petitioner to approach the respondent Board. The board having been directed by the Hon'ble High Court to extend the similar treatment to the petitioner, in case junior to the petitioner had been retained by the respondent board.

5. It is further the case of the petitioner, that certain similar situated persons had been re-engaged by the respondents either directly or on the basis of the awards passed by this Court. One of them being reference No. 13/2006 titled as Gopal Singh Vs. Executive Engineer, has been annexed alongwith by the petitioner as Annexure A-2.

6. It is further averred by the petitioner that in-spite of directions issued by the Hon'ble High Court on 1-12-2010 [*vide* CWP(T) No. 8918/2008], the respondent board did not consider the case of the petitioner and he was again constrained to file a Civil Writ Petition No. 4894/2011 and the Hon'ble High Court *vide* an order dated 28-3-2016, permitted the petitioner to raise a demand in view of order dated 6-11-2002, before the Labour-*cum*-Conciliation Officer and hence the present reference.

7. The petitioner thus eventually averred that the termination was illegal and bad in the eyes of law being violative of the provisions of The Industrial Disputes Act, more so, as persons junior to the petitioner had been retained by the respondent board namely one Dharam Dass and Gopal Dass. They had also been granted work charge status by the respondent, whereas the services of the petitioner had been illegally terminated. The petitioner thus seeks reinstatement in service alongwith all consequential benefits including back-wages.

8. While contesting the claim, the respondent board *inter-alia* raised preliminary objections *vis-a-vis* maintainability, non joinder and mis-joinder of necessary parties and the petitioner having not approached this Tribunal with clean hands. The respondent board has also raised the objection relating to limitation. Per the respondents, the petitioner worked on muster roll basis uptill 21-3-1998 and till that time he had worked for only 150 days with the board. The petitioner had worked till 16-4-2002 on the strength of the stay order granted by the Administrative Tribunal *w.e.f.* 15-11-1998, as directed *vide* OA No. 1631 of 1998. As per the respondents, CWP No. 8918 of 2008 was disposed off by the Hon'ble High Court *vide* a judgment dated 1-12-2010 and as such there is a delay of six years in raising the Industrial Dispute after the judgment was passed by the Hon'ble High Court and from the date of termination the delay is about eighteen years.

9. On merits, it is the contention of the respondent board that the petitioner was initially engaged as a beldar on daily wage basis on 26-6-1993 and he worked as such till 21-3-1998 and that too intermittently. The petitioner had only worked for 115 days in the first instance. It was on the strength of the interim order passed by the Ld. H.P. State Administrative Tribunal in OA No. 1631 of 1998 that the petitioner was re-engaged *w.e.f.* 15-11-1998 till his termination on 16-4-2002, that is, after the disposal of OA No. 1631 of 1998, which was dismissed for want of jurisdiction and returned to the petitioner. The petitioner was discharged by the respondent board after giving him one month's advance

notice. The respondent board has placed on record the mandays chart of the petitioner *vide* Annexure R-1 (Ex. RW-1/A).

10. Further per the respondents, the petitioner has only worked for 32 days in the year 1993, 75 days in 1994 and 8 days in 1998. The petitioner had never worked in the years, 1995, 1996 and 1997. The petitioner had never completed 240 days in any calendar year. Per the respondents, his services were never terminated, rather, he had left the job of his own violation and the provisions of Industrial Disputes Act are not attracted in the instant case. The petitioner was duly discharged from his duties after giving him one month's notice, on the disposal of OA No. 1631 of 1998. The petitioner was thus not entitled to regularization.

11. It is further the case of the respondent that the name of the petitioner had inadvertently appeared in the work-charge list and the mistake was bonafide. Per the respondent, the list dated 6-11-2002 was prepared much after the petitioner had been discharged from his service on 16-4-2002. Even, thereafter, the petitioner had approached the Ld. H.P. State Administrative Tribunal *vide* OA No. 3039 of 2002 and due to the winding up of the Administrative Tribunal, the matter was transferred to the Hon'ble High Court *vide* CWP(T) 8918 of 2008 and the same was disposed of on 1-12-2010 with the directions to the petitioner to make a representation to the respondent board. The petitioner had preferred a representation and the same came to be rejected by the competent authority on 2-4-2011 *vide* Annexure R-8. The rejection of the representation is stated to be just and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case.

12. The persons alleged to be juniors are said to be workmen who were in continuous service or who had been ordered to be re-engaged by the Court. The respondents, thus prayed that the claim being devoid of merits be dismissed.

13. While filing rejoinder, the petitioner controverted the averments in the reply and further reiterated those in the statement of claim.

14. On 4-5-2018, the following issues had come to be framed by my Learned Predecessor:

1. Whether the demand raised by the petitioner for re-instatement of his service alongwith seniority and consequently regularization is legal and justified, as alleged? ..OPP.
2. If issue No. 1 is proved in affirmative, to what relief of monetary benefits and other service benefits the petitioner is entitled? ..OPP.
3. Whether the petition is not maintainable as alleged? ..OPR.
4. Whether the petition is hit by delay and laches, as alleged? ..OPR.
5. Relief:

15. Having considered the pleadings, evidence and other attendant material placed on record, my findings on the issues framed are thus:—

Issue No. 1 Partly yes

<i>Issue No. 2</i>	Entitled to reinstatement with seniority and continuity but without back-wages.
<i>Issue No. 3 :</i>	No
<i>Issue No. 4 :</i>	No
<i>Relief:</i>	Reference answered partly in favour of the petitioner and against the respondents per operative part of award.

REASONS FOR FINDINGS

Issues No. 1 & 2 :

16. Both the issues are being taken up together as they are correlated and intermingled.

17. The case has a chequered history. Initially, the petitioner had approached the Ld. H.P. State Administrative Tribunal *vide* OA No. 1631 of 1998 and he came to be re-engaged on 15-11-1998, in pursuance to orders passed on 6-11-1998. Eventually, the said OA came to be disposed of on 6-3-2002. It was apparently for want of jurisdiction as the lis was covered under the Industrial Disputes Act. After the dismissal of the said OA, the services of the petitioner was finally done away with. It resulted in the petitioner again approaching the Learned Administrative Tribunal *vide* OA No. 3039 of 2002. The matter was transferred to the Hon'ble High Court and came to be registered as CWP(T) 8918 of 2008.

18. Hon'ble high Court directed the respondent board to consider the representation of the petitioner, in case persons junior to him had been re-engaged. The representation also came to be dismissed *vide* an order dated 2-4-2011 passed by the Executive Director (Personal) HPSEB.

19. It was again follow by another round of litigation, when the petitioner filed CWP No. 4894 of 2011 assailing the order dated 2-4-2011 passed by the respondent board and also seeking similar treatment given to other similar situated/junior persons and for implementing the office order dated 6-11-2002. It resulted in the Hon'ble High Court allowing the petitioner to raise demand in view of order dated 6-11-2002 before the Labour-cum-Conciliation Officer within two weeks and which has finally culminated in the present reference.

20. Admittedly, the petitioner had never completed 240 days in any of the calendar years. He had worked for about 32 days in 1993, 75 days in 1994 and around 8 days in the year, 1998. Therefore, the infringement of the provisions of section 25-F do not come into play. But, it would be relevant to point out that one Shri Gopal Singh, was engaged on 1-6-1996, Mahender Lal was engaged on 1-10-1997 and Dharam Dass had been engaged on 26-12-1993. They were thus certainly junior to the petitioner. As per the records maintained by the respondent these three have also not put in 240 days in any of the calendar years, they worked with the respondent board. As per Ex. PW-1/D on record, undoubtedly issued by the respondent board themselves Gopal Singh had worked for only 128 days from 1-6-1997 to 21-3-1998, Mahender Lal had worked for 49 days for two years *i.e.* the years 1997-98 and Dharam Dass had worked for 162 days from the year, 1993 till 1998 ranging from 6 days in the year, 1993 and 82 days in 1997. Therefore, the contention of the petitioner that persons junior to him have been retained does lend credence to the fact that the provisions of section

25-G had been violated. It is also explicitly clear from Ex. PW-1/D that none of the persons junior to the petitioner had completed 240 days in any of the calendar years, like the petitioner, still they were retained.

21. The respondent board while contesting the claim have not categorically denied that persons junior to the petitioner were retained or that the principles of last come first go was strictly followed, but, have tried to contend that the alleged juniors were either in continuous service of the respondent board and fulfilled the eligibility criteria in accordance with law and as such the Hon'ble Court has condoned the breaks in their service. I am afraid, the stand taken by the respondent board is totally contrary to Ex. PW-1/D, which clearly shows that not only the said Gopal Singh, Mahender and Dharam Dass were appointed as daily wagers after the petitioner, but, they were never in continuous service. In fact they were placed equally bad as the petitioner, in terms of the number of days put in, by them, as discussed hereinabove. Even, though in the reply the respondents have contested the claim of the petitioner on the ground of maintainability, more so, keeping in view the earlier litigations and the petition being hopelessly barred by time, which aspect shall be separately dealt with, in the issues to be discussed herein below.

22. It is by now well established that if a person is to be retrenched, the employer shall ordinarily retrench the workman who was the last person employed in that category. It is also by now well settled that infraction of section 25-G, hits a mandatory provision, and the non compliance thereof is fatal to the employer. The provisions of section 25-G are mandatory in nature and are necessarily to be complied with, at the time of retrenchment, even if, the workman has not completed 240 days in a calendar year. For invoking the protection of sections 25-G and 25-H, the requirement of having completed 240 days is not a condition precedent. This proposition of law is fairly well settled and does not require any further elucidation.

23. Even otherwise, a bare glance at the list of T-mates working in Electric Division HPSEB, Sunni, annexed alongwith Ex. PW-2/A, wherein the workmen were ordered to be brought on work charge *ex-facie* shows that there were many other people juniors to the petitioner *i.e.* engaged much after him, over and apart from Gopal Singh, Mahender and Dharam Dass. That being so while retrenching workmen, the principles of "last come, first go" had to be scrupulously followed, which was apparently not done by the respondent board.

24. Even, as per the statement of Shri Hukam Chand (PW-2), Senior Assistant, Electric Division Sunni, Mahender Lal was engaged on 1-10-1997 and one Gian Chand was engaged on 1-3-1999. Shri Gurcharan Singh, Assistant Engineer, Electric Sub Division Jalog, Tehsil Sunni, who has appeared as RW-1, has tacitly tried to state that only those juniors of the petitioner have been reinstated, who were ordered to be re-engaged by the Court. He has also admitted that one Jia Lal s/o Shri Wagru Ram was also engaged in the year, 1997.

25. The conjoint reading of the pleadings and the evidence discussed hereinabove, clearly goes to show that the provisions of section 25-G were given a go bye, by the respondent board. It being a mandatory provision was statutorily required to be followed in sum and substance was totally ignored by the respondent board. Since, juniors to the petitioner have been retained by the respondent, the termination of the petitioner is indeed bad in the eyes of law, being violative of the express provisions of section 25-G of the Industrial Disputes Act. The action of the respondent is thus illegal, unjustified and arbitrary and cannot withstand legal scrutiny. The issue is decided accordingly. The petitioner is entitled to reinstatement alongwith seniority and continuity but without back-wages. Seeing to the peculiar

circumstances of the case and more so the petitioner had not worked with the respondent board during the inter regnum, no back wages are being ordered in favour of the petitioner.

Issues No. 3 & 4 :

26. Both the issues are being taken up together as they are interrelated.

27. Much has been urged by the Learned Counsel for the respondent board that the claim is not only barred by delay and laches but it is also not maintainable keeping in view the orders passed by the Learned HP State Administrative Tribunal and the Hon'ble High Court from time to time. Per the Learned Counsel, the petitioner's representation made in pursuance to the judgment of the Hon'ble high Court on 1-12-2010 in CWP(T) No. 8918 of 2010 has attained finality as it was rejected by the respondent board and the said rejection has never been challenged by the petitioner. He would thus contend that neither is the claim maintainable and it is also hit by the vice of delay. I am afraid that the contentions so raised by the Learned Counsel cannot be sustained.

28. The question of delay and laches so raised by the respondent board in fact wanes into insignificance by virtue of the orders passed by the Hon'ble High Court in CWP No. 4894 of 2011, decided on 28-3-2016. The Hon'ble high Court allowed the petitioner to raise a demand in view of the order dated 6-11-2002 before the Labour-cum-Conciliation Officer, within a period of two weeks. The question thus loses all relevance. By fiction of law, the question of limitation has become redundant and stands impliedly decided by the Hon'ble High Court while deciding the aforesaid writ petition. It further gains significance when one goes through the grounds espoused in the writ petition No. 4894 of 2011. It has been filed by the petitioner challenging the rejection of his representation by the respondent board, as a sequel to the orders passed by the Hon'ble High Court in CWP(T) No. 8918 of 2008 on 1-12-2010. Thus, it is more than clear that the orders passed by the Hon'ble High Court on 28-3-2016 in CWP No. 4894/2011 were passed in pursuance to the challenge made to the rejection order passed by the respondent board on 1-12-2010. It has virtually revived the cause of action of the petitioner and impliedly held that the question of delay and laches will not come in the way of the petitioner while raising the dispute. Both these issues are thus decided against the respondent and in favour of the petitioner.

Relief :

For the foregoing reasons discussed hereinabove *supra*, the reference is allowed partly. The termination of the petitioner is held to be violative of section 25-G of the Industrial Disputes Act. The same is accordingly set aside. The respondents are directed to re-engage the petitioner forthwith. The petitioner shall be entitled to seniority and continuity from the date of his illegal termination, though except back-wages. The reference is answered accordingly. Let a copy of this award be sent to the appropriate government for publication in the official gazette. File, after completion, be consigned to records.

Announced in the open Court today this 19th day of January, 2019.

Sd/-
(CHIRAG BHANU SINGH),
Presiding Judge,
Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Shimla.

**IN THE COURT OF SH. CHIRAG BHANU SINGH, PRESIDING JUDGE, H.P.
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, SHIMLA**

Reference No. 31 of 2017

Instituted on 27-01-2017

Decided on 8-1-2019

Himalayan International School Workers Union, through its president and General Secretary, Chharabra, District Shimla, H.P. *. Petitioner.*

M/s Himalayan International School Chharabra, Shimla, H.P. *. Respondent.*

Reference under section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947

For petitioner : Shri Niranjana Verma, Advocate.

For respondent : Ex-party.

ORDER/AWARD

By way of the present reference the appropriate Government seeks determination of the collective demands raised by the workmen, from this Court on the following point:—

“Whether miscellaneous demands contained in demand notice dated 16-10-2015 (copy enclosed) submitted by the President and General Secretary, Himalayan International School Workers Union, Chharabra, Shimla, H.P., raised before and to be fulfilled by the Employer/Management/Principal, M/s Himalayan International School, Chharabra, Shimla, H.P. are legal, justified and maintainable? If yes, retrospectively from which date, what monetary and other service benefits the employees/workers employed in the aforesaid establishment are entitled to from the above employer/management?”

2. In pursuance to the reference the worker union in its claim have raised some generic demands. The Union avers that the respondent/management is not adhering to the Labour Laws in the School and are not fulfilling the lawful demands of the workers. They were constrained to raise the dispute *vide* a demand notice dated 16-10-2015 U/s 2 (K) of the Industrial Disputes Acts, but to no avail.

3. The demands espoused by the workers union in the demand notice and the claim may be summarized thus:—

- (i) Salary of the workers be increased by 25%
- (ii) The salary of the workers be paid by 7th day of every month
- (iii) As per the service condition leave salary, Medical Facility and other facilities be provided to the worker of the union.
- (iv) Eight hours duty be implemented

- (v) The additional work except the category of the worker should be banned
- (vi) The drivers be provided night facilities and no overtime work should be taken from them.
- (vii) The annual increment of the workers which is not paid from the year 2005 be paid to the workers and the arrears of the same should be paid to the workers with immediate effect.
- (viii) The arrears of two months of the salary (as increased by the Govt. from April, 2014) be paid with immediate effect.
- (ix) The workers who are residing in the accommodation provided by the school should not be disturbed and the deduction done by the Management in their salary be stopped.
- (x) That double amount be paid to the workers for their over time
- (xi) An employee should not be forced to put his reliever at the time of proceeding on leave.

4. The respondent management in its wisdom thought it prudent not to appear, despite having being served. They were set *ex-parte vide* an order dated 23-08-2017 passed by my Ld. Predecessor. The tracking report issued by the postal department unequivocally shows that the registered letter had been duly delivered to the respondents. However they chose not to contest the proceedings.

5. The question which arises for the determination may be cast thus;

1. Whether the demands of the workman as contained in the demand notice dated 16-10-2015 are legal, genuine and justified, if so to what relief the workmen are entitled to? ..OPP.

2. Relief

6. Having considered the pleadings, evidence and other attendant materials placed on record my findings on the issues framed above are thus:

Issue No. 1: Partly-yes

Relief: Partly allowed as per the operative part of the award

REASONS FOR FINDINGS

Issue No. 1:

7. The workers union while raising the demands on 16-10-2015 had *inter-alia* sought increase in their salary by 25% further submitting that the salary be paid by 7th day of every month, 8 hours duty be implemented and double the amount be paid to the workers for their over time. They also sought that the increments of the workers which have not been paid to them since 2005 be paid alongwith arrears. The drivers be provided night facilities and no over time work be taken from them. The arrears of two months salary (as increased by the Govt. from April, 2014) be also paid and the workers staying in the school premises be not

disturbed and no deduction be made from their salaries. The workman also espoused that while proceeding on leave they be not forced to bring a reliever.

8. To substantiate the averments so made the President of the Himalayan International School worker union, Chharabra, Shimla appeared as PW-1. Apart from placing on record the registration certificate of the union (EX. PW-1/A) and the resolution authorizing him to depose on behalf of the union (Ex. PW-1/B), deposed that the management did not follow the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act and the other Labour Laws. The union had raised demand notice (Ex. PW-1/C) before the Labour-cum-Conciliation Officer Shimla and on failure thereof the union is before this court. The respondent be directed to accept the demands so raised by the union and the claim be allowed.

9. This is, but all the evidence lead by the workers union. Not only are the demands raised by the generic, but, so is the evidence. It is shorn of any detail. Apart from a broad and a sweeping statement that the management does not follow the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act and other Labour Laws, nothing more has been brought on record to show the violations being made by the respondent/management. Though the reference envisages grant of monetary and other service benefits, but there is no mention to the same either in the claim or the evidence. The claim does not even quantify any monetary benefits payable to the workmen.

10. In the claim petition the union has sought an increase of 25% of salary, but, nothing has been averred nor any evidence led to show as to from when, why, and how the increase by 25% is permissible. There is even no mention as to what are the salaries of the workmen what are they receiving or what would be the hiked salary. It also does not remotely show, since when the raise was payable and at what rates.

11. Having said so it does not preclude this court from taking notice of certain provisions of the Labour Laws which are otherwise mandatorily required to be followed by every employer, for instance the provisions of the Minimum Wages Act, 1948 and The payment of Wages Act, 1936 are required to be followed in pith and substance, without any demur. Both the Acts are germane in respect of payment of wages to the workmen. The Acts *inter-alia* postulate payment of Minimum Wages, fixation of wage periods, hours for a normal working day, overtime etc.

12. A few of the demands raised by the workmen in the demand notice dated 16-10-2015 hinge on the mandatory provisions of the aforesaid Acts. The respondents are duty bound to respect the mandate of the two Acts and grant benefits in accruing thereof to the petitioner union.

13. The demands raised by the workmen at Sl. No. 2, 4, 5 and 10 are required to be adhered by the respondents strictly in consonance with the provisions of the two Acts, as noticed hereinabove. The respondents shall grant all statutory benefits flowing to the workmen under the provisions of the Minimum Wages Act, 1948 in respect of payment of salaries before 7th of every month and as per the fixation of normal working hours each day and payment of over time. The analogous provisions of The Payment of Wages Act, 1936, shall also be adhered strictly.

14. Though, the union had raised certain demands *vis-a-vis* grant of some annual increments and arrears of two month salary in pursuance to some hike allegedly made from the year, 2005 by the Government, but, strangely there is not a whisper as to what were the rate of increment payable or when was the notification issued hiking the salaries in the year,

2005. Nothing is decipherable regarding the grant of increments and arrears of salary from the record. In fact, nothing has been placed on record in this behalf by the union.

15. The demands raised by the union, except demands No. 2, 4, 5 and 10, thus, seem to be embroiled in the realm of uncertainty, as no contemporaneous record has been placed on the file. The bald statement of the President that the Labour Laws are being violated by the respondent/management will not advance the case of the union in any way. No effort has been made by the union to substantiate the assertions made in the claim. A non-serious attempt, frivolous and a vexatious effort has been made by the union. There is neither an averment nor any evidence to substantiate the same.

16. For the reasons discussed hereinabove it is held that the demands of the workmen except demands No. 2, 4, 5 and 10 are frivolous and vexatious. However, demands No. 2, 4, 5 and 10 will have to be addressed by the respondent/management strictly in consonance with the provisions of The Minimum Wages Act, 1948 and The Payment Wages Act, 1936. Necessary compliances with the analogous provisions of the two aforesaid Acts will have to enure for the benefit of the workmen forthwith. Issue is decided accordingly.

Relief :

For all the reasons discussed hereinabove the reference is partly allowed. The demands of the petitions/workmen at Sl. No. 2, 4, 5 and 10 are held to be legal and valid. Consequently the respondents shall allow all benefits arising from The Minimum Wages Act, 1948 and The Payment of Wages Act, 1936 *vis-a-vis* Minimum Wages, fixation of wage period, hours for a normal working day and overtime. Necessary statutory compliances will be made forthwith. The reference is answered accordingly. A copy of this award be sent to the appropriate Government for publication in the official gazette and the file after completion the consigned to records.

Announced in the open court today this 8th day of January, 2019.

Sd/-
(CHIRAG BHANU SINGH)
Presiding Judge,
Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Shimla.

ब अदालत विवाह पंजीकरण अधिकारी, घुमारवीं, उप-मण्डल घुमारवीं, जिला बिलासपुर
(हि0प्र0)

1. Manish Kumar s/o Sh. Prakash Chand, Village Glah, P.O. Hatwar, Tehsil Ghumarwin, District Bilaspur (H.P.)

2. Rekha Kumari d/o Sh. Ashok Kumar, V.P.O. Dangar, Tehsil Ghumarwin, District Bilaspur (H.P.)

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रतिवादी ।

आम जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि प्रार्थी एक व दो ने इस न्यायालय में विवाह पंजीकरण करवाने का आवेदन किया है। अतः इस इशतहार द्वारा आम जनता व उपरोक्त आवेदन कर्ता के माता-पिता को इस विवाह के पंजीकरण बारे एतराज हो तो दिनांक 4-05-2019 या इससे पूर्व प्रातः 10.00 बजे तक इस न्यायालय में आपत्ति दर्ज करवा सकते हैं। इस तिथि के बाद कोई उजर स्वीकार नहीं किया जाएगा।

आज दिनांक 06-03-2019 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर एवं मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—
विवाह पंजीकरण अधिकारी,
घुमारवीं, उप-मण्डल घुमारवीं, जिला बिलासपुर (हि0 प्र0)।

ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता, प्रथम वर्ग डलहौजी, जिला चम्बा (हि0 प्र0)

श्री किशन चन्द पुत्र श्री नन्तो, निवासी भटठी, डाकघर सूदली, तहसील डलहौजी, जिला चम्बा,
हिमाचल प्रदेश प्रार्थी।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रत्यार्थीगण।

प्रार्थना—पत्र बराए नाम दुरुस्ती बारा इशतहार।

उपरोक्त प्रार्थी ने अधोहस्ताक्षरी की अदालत में प्रार्थना—पत्र ब्यानहल्फी बमय अन्य कागजात इस आशय से गुजारा है कि उसका सही नाम किशन चन्द है आधार कार्ड व परिवार नकल, ग्राम पंचायत सूदली में मेरा सही नाम किशन चन्द दर्ज है। लेकिन मेरी मलकीयती भूमि महाल उलेहड, पटवार वृत्त द्रमण में मेरा नाम कृष्णो दर्ज है जोकि गलत है। जिसकी दुरुस्ती की जावे।

इस सम्बन्ध में सर्वसाधारण जनता को बजरिया इशतहार सूचित किया जाता है कि प्रार्थी के नाम दुरुस्ती बारे यदि किसी को कोई उजर/एतराज हो तो वह असालतन या वकालतन अधोहस्ताक्षरी की अदालत में दिनांक 23-04-2019 को हाजिर आकर अपना एतराज दर्ज करवा सकता है। हाजिर न आने की सूरत में एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जा करके नाम दुरुस्ती के आदेश दे दिये जायेंगे।

आज दिनांक 07-03-2019 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

राजेश कुमार जरयाल,
सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम वर्ग,
डलहौजी, जिला चम्बा (हि0 प्र0)।

ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता, प्रथम वर्ग डलहौजी, जिला चम्बा (हि0 प्र0)

श्री राजीव कुमार पुत्र श्री व्यास देव, निवासी पधरोटू, डाकघर गोली, तहसील डलहौजी, जिला चम्बा,
हिमाचल प्रदेश प्रार्थी।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रत्यार्थीगण।

प्रार्थना—पत्र बराए नाम दुरुस्ती बारा इश्तहार।

उपरोक्त प्रार्थी ने अधोहस्ताक्षरी की अदालत में प्रार्थना—पत्र ब्यानहल्फी बमय अन्य कागजात इस आशय से गुजारा है कि उसका सही नाम राजीव कुमार है आधार कार्ड व राशन कार्ड, स्कूल प्रमाण—पत्र परिवार नकल, ग्राम पंचायत पधारोटू में मेरा सही नाम राजीव कुमार दर्ज है। लेकिन मेरी मलकीयती भूमि महाल आर0 एफ0 कालाटोप, पटवार वृत्त रूलयाणी में मेरा नाम संजीव कुमार दर्ज है जोकि गलत है। जिसकी दुरुस्ती की जावे।

इस सम्बन्ध में सर्वसाधारण जनता को बजरिया इश्तहार सूचित किया जाता है कि प्रार्थी के नाम दुरुस्ती बारे यदि किसी को कोई उजर/एतराज हो तो वह असालतन या वकालतन अधोहस्ताक्षरी की अदालत में दिनांक 23-04-2019 को हाजिर आकर अपना एतराज दर्ज करवा सकता है। हाजिर न आने की सूरत में एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जा करके नाम दुरुस्ती के आदेश दे दिये जायेंगे।

आज दिनांक 07-03-2019 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

राजेश कुमार जरयाल,
सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम वर्ग,
डलहौजी, जिला चम्बा (हि0 प्र0)।

ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता, प्रथम वर्ग डलहौजी, जिला चम्बा (हि0 प्र0)

श्री ब्याजू राम पुत्र श्री व्यास देव, निवासी करेलनू, डाकघर बगडढार, तहसील डलहौजी, जिला चम्बा, हिमाचल प्रदेश प्रार्थी।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रत्यार्थीगण।

प्रार्थना—पत्र बराए नाम दुरुस्ती बारा इश्तहार।

उपरोक्त प्रार्थी ने अधोहस्ताक्षरी की अदालत में प्रार्थना—पत्र ब्यानहल्फी बमय अन्य कागजात इस आशय से गुजारा है कि उसका सही नाम ब्याजू राम है आधार कार्ड व राशन कार्ड, स्कूल प्रमाण—पत्र, परिवार नकल, ग्राम पंचायत नगाली में मेरा सही नाम ब्याजू राम दर्ज है। लेकिन मेरी मलकीयती भूमि महाल नूँह, पटवार वृत्त नगाली में मेरा नाम राज कुमार दर्ज है जोकि गलत है। जिसकी दुरुस्ती की जावे।

इस सम्बन्ध में सर्वसाधारण जनता को बजरिया इश्तहार सूचित किया जाता है कि प्रार्थी के नाम दुरुस्ती बारे यदि किसी को कोई उजर/एतराज हो तो वह असालतन या वकालतन अधोहस्ताक्षरी की अदालत में दिनांक 23-04-2019 को हाजिर आकर अपना एतराज दर्ज करवा सकता है। हाजिर न आने की सूरत में एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जा करके नाम दुरुस्ती के आदेश दे दिये जायेंगे।

आज दिनांक 10-03-2019 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

राजेश कुमार जरयाल,
सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम वर्ग,
डलहौजी, जिला चम्बा (हि0 प्र0)।

In the Court of Marriage Officer-cum-Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Hamirpur (H.P.)

In the matter of :

1. Sh. Devinder Kumar s/o Khushi Ram, r/o House No. 65, Ward No. 8, Hamirpur, Tehsil & District Hamirpur (H.P.), and

2. Smt. Neelam Kumari d/o Sh. Krishan Chand, r/o Village & P.O. Dhaneta, Tehsil Nadaun, District Hamirpur (H.P.) *Applicants.*

Versus

General Public

Subject.— Notice for Registration of Marriage.

Sh. Devinder Kumar & Smt. Neelam Kumari have filed an application u/s 16 of Special Marriage Act, 1954 alongwith affidavits in the court of undersigned in which they have stated that they have solemnized their marriage on 31-10-1977 at House No. 65, Ward No. 8, Hamirpur, Tehsil & District Hamirpur (H.P.) as per Hindu rites and customs.

Therefore, the general public is hereby informed through this notice that any person who has any objection regarding this marriage can file the objection personally or in writing before this court on or before 26-04-2019. The objection received after 26-04-2019 will not be entertained and marriage will be registered accordingly.

Issued today on 23-03-2019 under my hand and seal of the court.

Seal.

Sd/-

*Marriage Officer-cum-Sub-Divisional Magistrate,
Hamirpur (H.P.).*

In the Court of Marriage Officer-cum-Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Hamirpur (H.P.)

In the matter of :

1. Sh. Vivek Sharma s/o Sh. Kishori Lal Sharma, r/o House No. 74, Ward No. 8, Hamirpur, Tehsil & Distt. Hamirpur, and

2. Smt. Varsha Sharma d/o Sh. Rajesh Sharma, r/o V.P.O. Didwin Tikker, Tehsil and District Hamirpur (H.P.) *Applicants.*

Versus

General Public

Subject.— Notice for Registration of Marriage.

Sh. Vivek Sharma & Smt. Varsha Sharma have filed an application u/s 16 of Special Marriage Act, 1954 alongwith affidavits in the court of undersigned in which they have stated that they have solemnized their marriage on 25-01-2019 at House No. 74, Ward No. 8, Hamirpur, Tehsil & Distt. Hamirpur as per Hindu rites and customs.

Therefore, the general public is hereby informed through this notice that any person who has any objection regarding this marriage can file the objection personally or in writing before this court on or before 26-04-2019. The objection received after 26-04-2019 will not be entertained and marriage will be registered accordingly.

Issued today on 23-03-2019 under my hand and seal of the court.

Seal.

Sd/-

*Marriage Officer-cum-Sub-Divisional Magistrate,
Hamirpur (H.P.).*

In the Court of Marriage Officer-cum-Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Hamirpur (H.P.)

In the matter of :

1. Sh. Kanchan Sharma s/o Sh. Shambhu Nath, r/o Village Kohlwin, P.O. Barin Mandir, Tehsil Bamson, District Hamirpur (H.P.), and
2. Ms. Aarti d/o Gauru Ram, r/o Village Thanoty, P. O. Judera, Tehsil & District Chamba (H.P.)

Applicants.

Versus

General Public

Subject.— Notice of the intended Marriage.

Sh. Kanchan Sharma and Ms. Aarti have filed an application u/s 5 of Special Marriage Act, 1954 alongwith affidavits in the court of undersigned in which they stated that they intend to solemnized their marriage within next three calendar months. Therefore, the General Public is hereby informed through this notice that any person who has any objection regarding this marriage can file the objection personally or in writing before this court on or before 22-04-2019. The objection received after 22-04-2019 will not be entertained and marriage will be registered accordingly.

Issued today on 16-03-2019 under my hand and seal of the court.

Seal.

Sd/-

*Marriage Officer-cum-Sub-Divisional Magistrate,
Hamirpur (H.P.).*

In the Court of Marriage Officer-cum-Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Hamirpur (H.P.)

In the matter of :

1. Sh. Sameer Khanna s/o Sh. Subhash Khanna, r/o Ward No. 5, V. P.O. Bhota, Tehsil Barsar, District Hamirpur (H.P.), and

2. Sarita d/o Sh. Santosh Kumar, r/o Village Jatehari, P. O. Jhaniyari, Tehsil & District Hamirpur (H.P.)

Versus

General Public

Subject.— Notice of the intended Marriage.

Sh. Sameer Khanna and Sarita have filed an application u/s 5 of Special Marriage Act, 1954 alongwith affidavits in the court of undersigned in which they stated that they intend to solemnized their marriage within next three calendar months. Therefore, the General Public is hereby informed through this notice that any person who has any objection regarding this marriage can file the objection personally or in writing before this court on or before 22-04-2019. The objection received after 22-04-2019 will not be entertained and marriage will be registered accordingly.

Issued today on 16-03-2019 under my hand and seal of the court.

Seal.

Sd/-

*Marriage Officer-cum-Sub-Divisional Magistrate,
Hamirpur (H.P.).*

In the Court of Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Hamirpur (H. P.)

In the matter of :

1. Sh. Kamal Kishore s/o Sh. Rattan Chand, r/o Village Samrala, P.O. Didwin Tikker, Tehsil & District Hamirpur (H.P.). . . *Applicants.*

Versus

General Public

. . *Respondent.*

Subject.—Notice for proclamation late registration of date of birth as per section 13(3) in the Gram Panchayat Tikkar Didwin record.

Whereas Sh. Kamal Kishore has filed application u/s 13(3) of Birth and Death Registration Act, 1969 alongwith relevant record pertaining to his actual date of birth *i.e.* 7-08-1983 which is not entered in applicant's Gram Panchayat record inadvertently or ignorance and lack of knowledge to applicant and his family member.

Therefore, by the general public is hereby informed through this notice that any person who has any objection regarding issuing order for entry of date of birth of applicant Sh. Kamal Kishore

s/o Sh. Rattan Chand *i.e.* 07-08-1983 can file the objection personally or in writing before this court on or before 18-04-2019. The objection received after will not be entertained and order will be issued for the registration of date of birth accordingly.

Issued today under my hand and seal of the court.

Seal.

Sd/-
Sub-Divisional Magistrate,
Hamirpur(H.P.).

In the Court of Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Hamirpur (H. P.)

In the matter of :

1. Sh. Babu Ram s/o Sh. Udho Ram, r/o House No. 112, Ward No. 5, Brij Nagar, Tehsil & District Hamirpur (H.P.).
.. Applicants.

Versus

General Public

.. Respondent.

Subject.—Notice for late registration of date of birth as per section 13(3) in the Gram Panchayat Dhalot record.

Whereas Sh. Babu Ram s/o Sh. Udho Ram, r/o House No. 112, Ward No. 5, Brij Nagar, Tehsil & District Hamirpur (H.P.). has filed application u/s 13(3) of Birth and Death Registration Act, 1969 alongwith relevant record pertaining to his daughter Vaishali Bhatia actual date of birth *i.e.* 27-06-1984 which is not entered in applicant's Municipal Committee Hamirpur record inadvertently or ignorance and lack of knowledge to applicant and his family member. In this regard a proclamation was published by calling objections from the general public of Municipal Committee Hamirpur on or before 21-04-2019. The Local Registrar Birth & Death Municipal Committee Hamirpur reported that the registration of birth of Vaishali Bhatia is to be made by the Municipal Committee, where she was born.

Therefore by the general public is hereby informed through this notice that any person who has any objection regarding issuing order for entry of date of birth of Vaishali Bhatia *i.e.* 27-06-1984 can file the objection personally or in writing before this court on or before 21-04-2019. The objection received after will not be entertained and order will be issued for the registration of date of birth accordingly.

Issued today on 19-03-2019 under my hand and seal of the court.

Seal.

Sd/-
Sub-Divisional Magistrate,
Hamirpur (H.P.).

In the Court of Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Hamirpur (H. P.)

In the matter of :

1. Smt. Usha Kumari d/o Sh. Ran Singh, r/o V.P.O. Jhaniara, Tehsil & District Hamirpur (H.P.). . . *Applicants.*

Versus

General Public . . . *Respondent.*

Subject.—Notice for late registration of date of birth as per section 13(3) in the Gram Panchayat record.

Whereas Smt. Usha Kumari d/o Sh. Ran Singh, r/o V.P.O. Jhaniara, Tehsil & District Hamirpur (H.P.). has filed application u/s 13(3) of Birth and Death Registration Act, 1969 alongwith her affidavit and relevant record pertaining to her actual date of birth *i.e.* 16-11-1961 which is not entered in applicant's Gram Panchayat record inadvertently or ignorance and lack of knowledge to applicant and her family member. In this regard a proclamation was published by calling objections from the general public of Gram Panchayat Bassi Jhaniara on or before 20-04-2019. The Local Registrar Birth & Death Gram Panchayat Bassi Jhaniara reported that the registration of birth of Smt. Usha Kumari is to be made by the Gram Panchayat Bassi Jhaniara, where she was born.

Therefore by the general public is hereby informed through this notice that any person who has any objection regarding issuing order for entry of date of birth of Smt. Usha Kumari *i.e.* 16-11-1961 can file the objection personally or in writing before this court on or before 20-04-2019.

The objection received after will not be entertained and order will be issued for the correctness of name of the applicant accordingly.

Issued today on 19-03-2019 under my hand and seal of the court.

Seal.

Sd/-
Sub-Divisional Magistrate,
Hamirpur(H.P.).

In the Court of Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Hamirpur (H. P.)

In the matter of :

1. Smt. Kunta Devi d/o Late Sh. Tikhu Ram, r/o Village Tiyan, P.O. Uhal, Tehsil Bamson at Tauni Devi, District Hamirpur (H.P.). . . *Applicants.*

Versus

General Public . . . *Respondent.*

Subject.—Notice for late registration of date of birth as per section 13(3) in the Gram Panchayat Uhal record.

Whereas Smt. Kunta Devi d/o Late Sh. Tikhu Ram, r/o Village Tiyan, P.O. Uhal, Tehsil Bamson at Tauni Devi, District Hamirpur (H.P.) has filed application u/s 13(3) of Birth and Death Registration Act, 1969 alongwith her affidavit and relevant record pertaining to her actual date of birth i.e. 16-07-1935 which is not entered in applicant's Gram Panchayat record inadvertently or ignorance and lack of knowledge to applicant and her family member. In this regard a proclamation was published by calling objections from the general public of Gram Panchayat Uhal on or before 20-04-2019. The Local Registrar Birth & Death Gram Panchayat Uhal reported that the registration of birth of Smt. Kunta Devi is to be made by the Gram Panchayat Uhal, where she was born.

Therefore by the general public is hereby informed through this notice that any person who has any objection regarding issuing order for entry of date of birth of Smt. Kunta Devi i.e. 16-07-1935 can file the objection personally or in writing before this court on or before 20-04-2019.

The objection received after will not be entertained and order will be issued for the correctness of name of the applicant accordingly.

Issued today on 19-03-2019 under my hand and seal of the court.

Seal.

Sd/-
Sub-Divisional Magistrate,
Hamirpur(H.P.).

ब अदालत तहसीलदार एवं सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी, तहसील भुन्तर,
जिला कुल्लू (हि० प्र०)

केस नं० : 14-/NC/2019

तारीख पेशी : 22-04-2019

दायर तिथि : 16-01-2019

श्री गोल्डी पुत्र श्री प्रकाश चन्द पुत्र श्री भरेवतू, गांव बड़ा भुईन, डाकघर व तहसील भुन्तर, जिला कुल्लू (हि० प्र०) प्रार्थी।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रत्यार्थी।

विषय.— दरखास्त बराये कागजात माल में नाम की दुरुस्ती बारे।

प्रार्थना—पत्र श्री गोल्डी पुत्र श्री प्रकाश चन्द पुत्र श्री भरेवतू, गांव बड़ा भुईन, डाकघर व तहसील भुन्तर, जिला कुल्लू, हि० प्र० द्वारा दिनांक 16-01-2019 को इस अदालत में प्रार्थना-पत्र पेश किया है कि उसके दादा का नाम वाक्या फाटी, शिलीहार कोठी, कोटकन्डी, तहसील भुन्तर, जिला कुल्लू, हि० प्र० के राजस्व रिकार्ड में श्री भेखलू दर्ज है जबकि असली नाम भरेवतू पुत्र श्री इन्द्र है। अब प्रार्थी अराजी हजा के इन्द्राज में अपने दादा का नाम भेखलू से दुरुस्त करके भेखलू उर्फ भरेवतू दर्ज करना चाहता है।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को उपरोक्त प्रार्थी के दादा के नाम की दुरुस्ती का इन्द्राज करने बारे कोई एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 22-04-2019 को सुबह 10.00 बजे या इससे पूर्व असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर अदालत आकर अपना एतराज दर्ज करवा सकता है उसके उपरान्त कोई भी एतराज समायत न होगा तथा नियमानुसार नाम दुरुस्ती का इन्द्राज करने के आदेश पारित कर दिये जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 23-03-2019 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—
तहसीलदार एवं सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी,
तहसील भुन्तर, जिला कुल्लू (हि0 प्र0)।

ब अदालत कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी प्रथम श्रेणी एवं तहसीलदार भुन्तर, जिला कुल्लू (हि0 प्र0)

केस नं0 : 18 MT/19

दिनांक : 22-04-2019

दायर तिथि : 02-03-2019

1. तुले राम पुत्र श्री भोले राम, निवासी गांव बराधा बाग, डाकघर बराधा, तहसील भुन्तर, जिला कुल्लू (हि0 प्र0)।

2. श्रीमती बोधी देवी पुत्री श्री मोती राम, गांव त्रेहण, डाकघर पीपलागे, तहसील भुन्तर, जिला कुल्लू, हि0 प्र0।

बनाम

सर्वसाधारण एवं आम जनता

विषय.— प्रार्थना-पत्र जेर धारा 5(4) हि0 प्र0 रजिस्ट्रीकरण नियम, 2004 विवाह पंजीकरण बारे।

उपरोक्त मामला में प्रार्थीगण ने दिनांक 02-03-2019 को इस अदालत में प्रार्थना-पत्र मय शपथ पेश किये हैं कि उन्होंने दिनांक 18-10-2013 को शादी कर ली है और तब से दोनों पती-पत्नी के रूप में रहते चले आ रहे हैं। परन्तु प्रार्थीगण ने अपनी शादी का इन्द्राज सम्बन्धित ग्राम पंचायत बराधा, तहसील भुन्तर, जिला कुल्लू (हि0 प्र0) में दर्ज नहीं करवाया है।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को व सगे सम्बन्धियों को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उपरोक्त प्रार्थीगणों की शादी से सम्बन्धित पंचायत के अभिलेख में दर्ज करने बारे कोई एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 22-04-2019 को सुबह 10.00 बजे या इससे पूर्व असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर अदालत आकर अपना एतराज दर्ज करवा सकता है। इसके उपरान्त कोई भी एतराज समायत न होगा तथा नियमानुसार शादी दर्ज करने के आदेश सम्बन्धित ग्राम पंचायत पारित कर दिए जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 23-03-2019 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी प्रथम श्रेणी एवं तहसीलदार,
भुन्तर, जिला कुल्लू, हि0 प्र0।

ब अदालत कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी प्रथम श्रेणी एवं तहसीलदार भुन्तर, जिला कुल्लू (हि0 प्र0)

केस नं0 : 15-BT/2019

तारीख पेशी : 22-04-2019

दायर तिथि : 06-03-2019

श्री चमारु राम पुत्र श्री मंघरु राम, गांव मलाणा, डाकघर मलाणा, तहसील भुन्तर, जिला कुल्लू (हि0 प्र0)।

बनाम

सर्वसाधारण एवं आम जनता

विषय.— प्रार्थना-पत्र अधिनियम धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

श्री चमारु राम पुत्र श्री मंघरु राम, गांव मलाणा, डाकघर मलाणा, तहसील भुन्तर, जिला कुल्लू (हि0 प्र0) ने इस कार्यालय में प्रार्थना-पत्र मय शपथ-पत्र दिया गया है कि उसकी पुत्री शीरियान्शा का जन्म दिनांक 28-04-2016 को स्थान गांव मलाणा, डाकघर मलाणा, तहसील भुन्तर, जिला कुल्लू, हि0 प्र0 में हुआ है परन्तु उसके जन्म की तिथि का इन्द्राज किसी कारणवश ग्राम पंचायत मलाणा, तहसील भुन्तर, जिला कुल्लू, हि0 प्र0 के अभिलेख में दर्ज न किया है।

अतः इस इशतहार हजा द्वारा सर्वसाधारण को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को कुमारी शीरियान्शा पुत्री श्री चमारु राम के जन्म तिथि दर्ज करवाने बारे कोई आपत्ति हो तो वह दिनांक 22-04-2019 को सुबह 10.00 बजे या इससे पूर्व असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर अदालत आकर अपना एतराज दर्ज करवा सकता है। इसके उपरान्त कोई भी एतराज समायत न होगा तथा नियमानुसार जन्म तिथि दर्ज करवाने के आदेश सम्बन्धित ग्राम पंचायत को पारित कर दिए जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 23-03-2019 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी प्रथम श्रेणी एवं तहसीलदार,
भुन्तर, जिला कुल्लू, हि0 प्र0।

ब अदालत कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी प्रथम श्रेणी एवं तहसीलदार भुन्तर, जिला कुल्लू (हि0 प्र0)

केस नं0 : 19-MT/19

तारीख पेशी : 22-04-2019

दायर तिथि : 01-02-2019

1. निरत राम पुत्र श्री लाल चन्द, निवासी गांव शीरशु, डाकघर धारा, तहसील भुन्तर, जिला कुल्लू (हि0 प्र0)।

2. श्रीमती शारदा देवी पुत्री श्री दौलत राम, निवासी कोश नाला, डाकघर न्युली, तहसील भुन्तर, जिला कुल्लू, हि0 प्र0।

बनाम

विषय.— प्रार्थना-पत्र जेर धारा 5(4) हि0 प्र0 रजिस्ट्रीकरण नियम, 2004 विवाह पंजीकरण बारे।

उपरोक्त मामला में प्रार्थीगण उपरोक्त ने दिनांक 01-02-2019 को इस अदालत में प्रार्थना-पत्र मय शपथ पेश किये हैं कि उन्होंने दिनांक 26-04-2012 को शादी कर ली है और तब से दोनों पती-पत्नी के रूप में रहते चले आ रहे हैं। परन्तु प्रार्थीगण ने अपनी शादी का इन्द्राज सम्बन्धित ग्राम पंचायत रतोचा, तहसील भुन्तर, जिला कुल्लू (हि0 प्र0) में दर्ज नहीं करवाया है।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को व सगे सम्बन्धियों को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि किसी व्यक्ति को उपरोक्त प्रार्थीगणों की शादी से सम्बन्धित पंचायत के अभिलेख में दर्ज करने बारे कोई एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 22-04-2019 को सुबह 10.00 बजे या इससे पूर्व असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर अदालत आकर अपना एतराज दर्ज करवा सकता है। इसके उपरान्त कोई भी एतराज समायत न होगा तथा नियमानुसार शादी दर्ज करने के आदेश सम्बन्धित ग्राम पंचायत को पारित कर दिए जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 23-03-2019 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी प्रथम श्रेणी एवं तहसीलदार,
भुन्तर, जिला कुल्लू, हि0 प्र0।

ब अदालत कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी द्वितीय श्रेणी एवं नायब तहसीलदार भुन्तर,
जिला कुल्लू (हि0 प्र0)

केस नं0 : 13-BNT/2019

दायर तिथि : 13-06-2018

श्री ठाकुर दास पुत्र श्री ध्यानु राम, गांव शाहिटा, डाकघर कसलादी, तहसील भुन्तर, जिला कुल्लू, हि0 प्र0।

बनाम

सर्वसाधारण एवं आम जनता

विषय.— प्रार्थना-पत्र अधिनियम धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

श्री ठाकुर दास पुत्र श्री ध्यानु राम, गांव शाहिटा, डाकघर कसलादी, तहसील भुन्तर, जिला कुल्लू, हि0 प्र0 ने इस कार्यालय में प्रार्थना-पत्र मय शपथ-पत्र दिया है कि उसकी पुत्री भुवनेश्वरी का जन्म दिनांक 16-11-2015 को स्थान गांव शाहिटा, डाकघर कसलादी, तहसील भुन्तर, जिला कुल्लू, हि0 प्र0 में हुआ है परन्तु उसके जन्म की तिथि का इन्द्राज किसी कारणवश ग्राम पंचायत पीणी, तहसील भुन्तर, जिला कुल्लू, हि0 प्र0 के अभिलेख में दर्ज न किया है।

अतः इस इशतहार हजा द्वारा सर्वसाधारण को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को कुमारी भुवनेश्वरी पुत्री श्री ठाकुर दास की जन्म तिथि दर्ज करवाने बारे कोई आपत्ति हो तो वह दिनांक 25-04-2019 को सुबह 10.00 बजे या इससे पूर्व असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर अदालत आकर अपना एतराज दर्ज करवा

सकता है। इसके उपरान्त कोई भी एतराज समायत न होगा तथा नियमानुसार जन्म तिथि दर्ज करवाने के आदेश सम्बन्धित ग्राम पंचायत को पारित कर दिए जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 27-03-2019 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी द्वितीय श्रेणी एवं नायब तहसीलदार,
भुन्तर, जिला कुल्लू, हि0 प्र0।

**ब अदालत कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी द्वितीय श्रेणी एवं नायब तहसीलदार भुन्तर,
जिला कुल्लू (हि0 प्र0)**

केस नं0 : 14-BNT/2019

दायर तिथि : 13-06-2018

श्री ठाकुर दास पुत्र श्री ध्यानु राम, गांव शाहिटा, डाकघर कसलादी, तहसील भुन्तर, जिला कुल्लू, हि0 प्र0।

बनाम

सर्वसाधारण एवं आम जनता

विषय.— प्रार्थना-पत्र अधिनियम धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

श्री ठाकुर दास पुत्र श्री ध्यानु राम, गांव शाहिटा, डाकघर कसलादी, तहसील भुन्तर, जिला कुल्लू, हि0 प्र0 ने इस कार्यालय में प्रार्थना-पत्र मय शपथ-पत्र दिया है कि उसकी पुत्री सनाक्षी का जन्म दिनांक 16-06-2017 को स्थान गांव शाहिटा, डाकघर कसलादी, तहसील भुन्तर, जिला कुल्लू, हि0 प्र0 में हुआ है परन्तु उसके जन्म की तिथि का इन्द्राज किसी कारणवश ग्राम पंचायत पीणी, तहसील भुन्तर, जिला कुल्लू, हि0 प्र0 के अभिलेख में दर्ज न किया है।

अतः इस इशतहार हजा द्वारा सर्वसाधारण को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को कुमारी सनाक्षी पुत्री श्री ठाकुर दास की जन्म तिथि दर्ज करवाने बारे कोई आपत्ति हो तो वह दिनांक 25-04-2019 को सुबह 10.00 बजे या इससे पूर्व असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर अदालत आकर अपना एतराज दर्ज करवा सकता है। इसके उपरान्त कोई भी एतराज समायत न होगा तथा नियमानुसार जन्म तिथि दर्ज करवाने के आदेश सम्बन्धित ग्राम पंचायत को पारित कर दिए जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 27-03-2019 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी द्वितीय श्रेणी एवं नायब तहसीलदार,
भुन्तर, जिला कुल्लू, हि0 प्र0।

**ब अदालत कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी द्वितीय श्रेणी एवं नायब तहसीलदार भुन्तर, जिला कुल्लू
(हि0 प्र0)**

केस नं0 : 13-MNT/19

दायर तिथि : 16-10-2017

1. टेक राम पुत्र श्री खियाल दास, निवासी गांव आशनी, डाकघर शियाह, तहसील भुन्तर, जिला कुल्लू (हि0 प्र0)।
2. श्रीमती सुमा पुत्री श्री तुले राम, गांव धारा, डाकघर गड़सा, तहसील भुन्तर, जिला कुल्लू (हि0 प्र0)।

बनाम

सर्वसाधारण एवं आम जनता

विषय.— प्रार्थना-पत्र जेर धारा 5(4) हि0 प्र0 रजिस्ट्रीकरण नियम, 2004 विवाह पंजीकरण बारे।

उपरोक्त मामला में प्रार्थीगण उपरोक्त ने दिनांक 16-10-2017 को इस अदालत में प्रार्थना-पत्र मय शपथ पेश किये हैं कि उन्होंने दिनांक 01-01-2005 को शादी कर ली है और तब से दोनों पती-पत्नी के रूप में रहते चले आ रहे हैं। परन्तु प्रार्थीगण ने अपनी शादी का इन्द्राज सम्बन्धित ग्राम पंचायत भलाण-I, तहसील भुन्तर, जिला कुल्लू (हि0 प्र0) में दर्ज नहीं करवाया है।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को व सगे सम्बन्धियों को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि किसी व्यक्ति को उपरोक्त प्रार्थीगणों की शादी से सम्बन्धित पंचायत के अभिलेख में दर्ज करने बारे कोई एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 25-04-2019 को सुबह 10.00 बजे या इससे पूर्व असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर अदालत आकर अपना एतराज दर्ज करवा सकता है। इसके उपरान्त कोई भी एतराज समायत न होगा तथा नियमानुसार शादी दर्ज करने के आदेश सम्बन्धित ग्राम पंचायत को पारित कर दिए जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 27-03-2019 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—

कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी द्वितीय श्रेणी एवं नायब तहसीलदार,
भुन्तर, जिला कुल्लू (हि0 प्र0)।

**ब अदालत कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी द्वितीय श्रेणी एवं नायब तहसीलदार भुन्तर, जिला कुल्लू
(हि0 प्र0)**

केस नं0 : 11-MNT/19

दायर तिथि : 25-3-2019

1. धर्म चन्द पुत्र श्री प्रीतम, निवासी गांव नौड़गां, डाकघर मौहल, तहसील भुन्तर, जिला कुल्लू (हि0 प्र0)।
2. श्रीमती निशु पुत्री श्री भादर सिंह, गांव टैहनसेरी, डाकघर मौहल, तहसील भुन्तर, जिला कुल्लू (हि0 प्र0)।

बनाम

सर्वसाधारण एवं आम जनता

विषय.— प्रार्थना-पत्र जेर धारा 5(4) हि0 प्र0 रजिस्ट्रीकरण नियम, 2004 विवाह पंजीकरण बारे।

उपरोक्त मामला में प्रार्थीगण उपरोक्त ने दिनांक 25-03-2019 को इस अदालत में प्रार्थना-पत्र मय शपथ पेश किये हैं कि उन्होंने दिनांक 20-02-2018 को शादी कर ली है और तब से दोनों पत्नी-पत्नी के रूप में रहते चले आ रहे हैं। परन्तु प्रार्थीगण ने अपनी शादी का इन्द्राज सम्बन्धित ग्राम पंचायत शिलीराजगिरी, तहसील भुन्तर, जिला कुल्लू (हि0 प्र0) में दर्ज नहीं करवाया है।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को व सगे सम्बन्धियों को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि किसी व्यक्ति को उपरोक्त प्रार्थीगणों की शादी से सम्बन्धित पंचायत के अभिलेख में दर्ज करने बारे कोई एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 25-04-2019 को सुबह 10.00 बजे या इससे पूर्व असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर अदालत आकर अपना एतराज दर्ज करवा सकता है। इसके उपरान्त कोई भी एतराज समायत न होगा तथा नियमानुसार शादी दर्ज करने के आदेश सम्बन्धित ग्राम पंचायत को पारित कर दिए जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 27-03-2019 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—

कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी द्वितीय श्रेणी एवं नायब तहसीलदार,
भुन्तर, जिला कुल्लू (हि0 प्र0)।

**In the Court of Marriage Officer-cum-Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Sadar,
District Mandi, H. P.**

In the matter of :

1. Sh. Bhoop Singh s/o Sh. Hem Singh, Village Nalhog, P.O. Baryara, Tehsil Kotli, District Mandi, H.P.

2. Smt. Annu Chauhan d/o Sh. Dhoom Bahadur Singh Chauhan, r/o In front of P.W.D. Bhone Islam Nagar, Bazpur Kashipur, Udham Singh Nagar, Uttarakhand-262401 (At presen wife of Sh. Bhoop Singh s/o Sh. Hem Singh, Village Nalhog, P.O. Baryara, Tehsil Kotli, District Mandi, H.P.
.. Applicants.

Versus

General Public

Subject.—Application for the registration of marriage under section 15 of Special Marriage Act, 1954.

Sh. Bhoop Singh s/o Sh. Hem Singh, Village Nalhog, P.O. Baryara, Tehsil Kotli, District Mandi, H.P. and Smt. Annu Chauhan d/o Sh. Dhoom Bahadur Singh Chauhan, r/o In front of P.W.D. Bhone Islam Nagar, Bazpur Kashipur, Udham Singh Nagar, Uttarakhand-262401 (At presen wife of Sh. Bhoop Singh s/o Sh. Hem Singh, Village Nalhog, P.O. Baryara, Tehsil Kotli, District Mandi, H.P. have filed an application alongwith affidavits in the court of undersigned under section 15 of Special Marriage Act, 1954 that they have solemnized their marriage on 23-02-2019 according to Hindu rites and customs at their respective houses District Mandi, H.P. and they are living together as husband and wife since then. Hence, their marriage may be registered under Special Marriage Act, 1954.

Therefore, the general public is hereby informed through this notice that any person who has any objection regarding this marriage, can file the objection personally or in writing before this court on or before 17-04-2019 after that no objection will be entertained and marriage will be registered.

Issued today on 18th day of March, 2019 under my hand and seal of the court.

Seal.

Sd/-

*Marriage Officer-cum-Sub-Divisional Magistrate,
Sadar, District Mandi (H.P.).*

ब अदालत श्री प्रकाश चन्द शर्मा, सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी, पधर, तहसील पधर,
जिला मण्डी (हि0 प्र0)

उनवान मुकद्दमा : 37(2)

तारीख पेशी : 23-04-2019

राजेश पुत्र श्री लाल सिंह, निवासी दरुण, डाकघर रोपा, तहसील पधर, जिला मण्डी, हि0 प्र0 प्रार्थी।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रत्यार्थी।

आवेदन पत्र.—जेर धारा 37(2) के अन्तर्गत नाम दुरुस्त करने बारा।

आवेदक राजेश पुत्र श्री लाल सिंह, निवासी दरुण, डाकघर रोपा, तहसील पधर, जिला मण्डी, हि0 प्र0 ने इस अदालत में आवेदन-पत्र गुजारा है कि उसका नाम ग्राम पंचायत रोपा के रिकार्ड व उसके शैक्षणिक कागजात में राजेश दर्ज है व उसके पिता का नाम लाल सिंह दर्ज है। जबकि उसका नाम महाल दरुण/499 के भू0-राजस्व अभिलेख में राजेश कुमार व इसके पिता का नाम लाल चन्द गलत दर्ज हुआ है तथा आवेदक ने इस अदालत से प्रार्थना की है कि उसका नाम राजेश कुमार के स्थान पर राजेश उर्फ राजेश कुमार व उसके पिता का नाम लाल चन्द के स्थान पर लाल सिंह उर्फ लाल चन्द दर्ज करने के लिखित आदेश दिये जावें।

अतः इस इश्तहार द्वारा आम जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उक्त नाम दर्ज करने बारा कोई उजर/एतराज हो तो वह असालतन या वकालतन तारीख पेशी 23-04-2019 को सुबह 10.00 बजे हाजिर होकर अपना उजर पेश कर सकता है बसूरत गैर-हाजिरी एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाकर उचित आदेश पारित कर दिए जाएंगे।

यह इश्तहार आज दिनांक 11-03-2019 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

प्रकाश चन्द शर्मा,
सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी,
पधर, तहसील पधर, जिला मण्डी (हि0 प्र0)।

**ब अदालत श्री प्रकाश चन्द शर्मा, सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी, पधर, तहसील पधर,
जिला मण्डी (हि0 प्र0)**

उनवान मुकद्दमा : 37(2)

तारीख पेशी : 23-04-2019

दलीप चन्द पुत्र श्री दिवान चन्द, निवासी दरुण, डाकघर रोपा, तहसील पधर, जिला मण्डी (हि0 प्र0)
प्रार्थी।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रत्यार्थी।

आवेदन पत्र.—जेर धारा 37(2) के अन्तर्गत नाम दुरुस्त करने बारा।

आवेदक दलीप चन्द पुत्र श्री दिवान चन्द, निवासी दरुण, डाकघर रोपा, तहसील पधर, जिला मण्डी (हि0 प्र0) ने इस अदालत में आवेदन—पत्र गुजारा है कि उसका नाम ग्राम पंचायत रिकार्ड व अन्य कागजात में दलीप चन्द दर्ज है जबकि महाल दरुण/499 के तमाम भू0—राजस्व अभिलेखों में उसका नाम दलीप कुमार दर्ज है जो गलत दर्ज हुआ है तथा आवेदक ने इस अदालत से प्रार्थना की है कि उसका नाम दलीप कुमार के स्थान पर दलीप चन्द दर्ज करने के लिखित आदेश दिये जावें।

अतः इस इश्तहार द्वारा आम जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उक्त नाम दर्ज करने बारा कोई उजर/एतराज हो तो वह असालतन या वकालतन तारीख पेशी 23-04-2019 को सुबह 10.00 बजे हाजिर होकर अपना उजर पेश कर सकता है बसूरत गैर—हाजिरी एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाकर उचित आदेश पारित कर दिए जाएंगे।

यह इश्तहार आज दिनांक 11-03-2019 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

प्रकाश चन्द शर्मा,
सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी,
पधर, तहसील पधर, जिला मण्डी (हि0 प्र0)।

**ब अदालत श्री प्रकाश चन्द शर्मा, सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी, पधर, तहसील पधर,
जिला मण्डी (हि0 प्र0)**

उनवान मुकद्दमा : 37(2)

तारीख पेशी : 23-04-2019

नागेश्वर पुत्र श्री चेत राम, निवासी व डाकघर गवाली, तहसील पधर, जिला मण्डी (हि0 प्र0) प्रार्थी।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रत्यार्थी।

आवेदन पत्र.—जेर धारा 37(2) के अन्तर्गत नाम दुरुस्त करने बारा।

आवेदक नागेश्वर पुत्र श्री चेत राम, निवासी व डाकघर गवाली, तहसील पधर, जिला मण्डी (हि0 प्र0) ने इस अदालत में आवेदन—पत्र गुजारा है कि उसका नाम ग्राम पंचायत रिकार्ड व अन्य कागजात में नागेश्वर

दर्ज है जबकि महाल गवाली/542 के तमाम भू-राजस्व अभिलेखों में उसका नाम नाग देव दर्ज है जो गलत दर्ज हुआ है तथा आवेदक ने इस अदालत से प्रार्थना की है कि उसका नाम नाग देव के स्थान पर नागेश्वर उर्फ नाग देव दर्ज करने के लिखित आदेश दिये जावें।

अतः इस इशतहार द्वारा आम जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उक्त नाम दर्ज करने बारा कोई उजर/एतराज हो तो वह असालतन या वकालतन तारीख पेशी 23-04-2019 को सुबह 10.00 बजे हाजिर होकर अपना उजर पेश कर सकता है बसूरत गैर-हाजिरी एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाकर उचित आदेश पारित कर दिए जाएंगे।

यह इशतहार आज दिनांक 11-03-2019 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

प्रकाश चन्द शर्मा,
सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी,
पधर, तहसील पधर, जिला मण्डी (हि0 प्र0)।